

**REMARKS:**

This paper is herewith filed in response to the Examiner's Office Action mailed on August 10, 2007 for the above-captioned U.S. Patent Application. This office action is a rejection of claims 42-49 of the application.

More specifically, the Examiner has rejected claims 42-49 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Applicant respectfully addresses the rejection.

In addition, the Examiner indicates that claims 1-5, 7-11, 14-23, 25-26, and 28-39 are allowed. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the allowance.

In regards to the rejection of claims 42-49 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, claims 42 has been amended for clarification and claim 47 have been amended to address the rejection. No new matter is added.

In the rejection the Examiner states:

"Claim 42 is confusing. The claim recites a plurality of means but the relationship between the means is unclear. For instance, there is no relationship between the means for storing the plurality of data structures and the other means recited in the claims. In addition, the claims recites a means to shift the result by a shift value, it is not clear what result the claim is referring to; the claim also recites a means to address a data structure, it seems to relate to the data structure previously recited in line 2."

The Applicant respectfully asserts that the relationship "between the means" as in claim 42 is clear.

Claim 42 recites:

"A decoder, comprising: means for storing a plurality of data structures representing a Huffman coding tree of height H including at least a first **data**

**structure** having an associated first offset value and an associated first **shift value** and a second **data structure** having an associated second **offset value** and an associated second **shift value**; means for subtracting an offset value from a codeword of H bits taken from a bitstream to produce a result; means for shifting the result by a shift value; and means for addressing a data structure using the shifted result,” (emphasis added)

The Applicant notes that as stated above claim 42 recites in part “means for storing a plurality of data structures[...] including at least a first data structure having an associated first offset value and an associated first shift value and a second data structure having an associated second offset value and an associated second shift value.” The Applicant respectfully submits that the remaining “means” recited in claim 42 refer to an “offset value,” “shift value,” and “data structure” recited in the means for storing as in claim 42. Thus, the Applicant respectfully contends that the “means” in the claim are linked because all of these features are referred to in the “means for storing a plurality of data structures” as in claim 42. Further, the Applicant notes that claim 42 has been amended for clarification to recite in part “means for subtracting an offset value from a codeword of H bits taken from a bitstream to produce a result.” Thereby, subsequent references to “the result” as in claim 42 are also clearly supported.

For at least these reasons the rejection of claim 42 is seen as overcome and the rejection should be removed.

Regarding the rejection of claim 47 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, the Applicant has amended claim 47 to address the rejection.

Claim 47 recites in part:

The decoder of claim 42, further comprising means, responsive to having obtained a value from addressing the data structure, for comparing using that value and in dependence upon a result of comparing to either use the value obtained from addressing the data structure to identify a symbol or a new current offset value.

The Applicant notes that claim 47 as amended recites in part “the value obtained from addressing the data structure.” Thus, the term “value” in line 3 clearly refers to a value obtained from addressing the data structure as in claim 47. The Applicant respectfully submits that the term “value” in line 3 is now clear and the rejection of claim 47 is seen as overcome. Thus, the rejection of claim 47 should be removed.

In view of the previous allowance of the subject matter of all claims presented herein, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass claims 1-5, 7-11, 14-23, 25-26, 28-39, and 42-49 to issue. The undersigned representative welcomes the opportunity to resolve any matters that may remain, formal or otherwise, via teleconference at the Examiner’s discretion.

Respectfully submitted:

  
John A. Garity

Reg. No.: 60,470

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, PC

4 Research Drive

Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203)925-9400

Facsimile: (203)944-0245

email: [jgarity@hspatent.com](mailto:jgarity@hspatent.com)

  
11/12/2007

Date

#### **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450,

S.N.: 10/568,009  
Art Unit: 2819

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

11/12/2007

Date

Elaine F. Brown

Name of Person Making Deposit